Cross-Border Acknowledgment of Academic Obstruction

A Systemic QA Dossier on Access Denial, Policy Inconsistency, and Accreditation Risk

Author: Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan
Affiliation: Faculty of Medicine, Semmelweis University (student)
Contact: swardan1@icloud.com | siddhartha.harsh@stud.semmelweis.hu | +36 70 350 4077
SSRN Author ID: 7768604
Case References: Ombudsman EBF–AJBH–309–2025 | Administrative Court 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2

Note on Scope

This paper is presented as a systemic quality assurance (QA) dossier under Act CCIV/2011 (National Higher Education Act, Hungary) and the ESG/WFME framework. It does not seek an individual remedy nor constitute a personal grievance. It evaluates institutional compliance with ESG 1.2 (programme deliverability), ESG 1.3 (student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment), and ESG 1.6 (learning resources) using primary documentary evidence (Neptun records, official emails, policy extracts), peer testimonies, and international notifications to accreditation bodies.

Abstract

This dossier synthesizes documentary evidence of administrative obstruction affecting access to compulsory anatomy practicals for a registered FM/CV student and the use of degraded examination specimens, alongside contradictory enforcement of internal policy. Following exhaustion of national remedies, the matter was acknowledged by international bodies (WFME/FAIMER redirection to MAB; ECFMG acknowledgment) and by the Irish DFHEARIS, establishing cross-border visibility. The dossier maps the fact pattern to Hungarian/EU law (Act CCIV/2011, Act XXV/2023; EU Charter arts 14/21/47) and QA standards (ESG 1.2/1.3/1.6; WFME 3.1/3.4), and proposes corrective actions: independent resource audit, codified/published rules applied consistently, retrospective academic remedy for exams held with substandard materials, and confirmation of lawful access for FM/CV registrants.

Keywords

ESG 1.2; ESG 1.3; ESG 1.6; WFME; FM/CV; Semmelweis; whistleblower; EBF–AJBH–309–2025; 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2; EU Charter 14/21/47; Act XXV/2023; Act CCIV/2011; quality assurance; accreditation

© 2025 S.H. Wardhan – QA dossier for accreditation/QA review. Case refs: EBF–AJBH–309–2025; 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2.

Abbreviations

FM — Retake ("Exempt From") course status permitting exam-only completion after prior registration/signature

CV — Exam-only registration code in Neptun (course-variant code)

SZMSZ_HKR — Semmelweis Study & Examination Regulations (Part III, English translation, 2024)

ESG — European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the EHEA

WFME — World Federation for Medical Education

DFHERIS — Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science (Ireland)

1. Purpose and Procedural Posture

This dossier documents how a registered FM/CV student was denied access to supervised anatomy practicals despite valid registration and a previously recorded signature, and how degraded specimens were used in assessment. It consolidates the record already filed under Ombudsman EBF–AJBH–309–2025 and Administrative Court 7.Kpk . 750.239/2025/2, and notes international acknowledgments (WFME/FAIMER→MAB; ECFMG; DFHERIS) to demonstrate cross-border relevance for accreditation and QA oversight.

2. Methods and Evidence Base

Evidence sources include: (i) Neptun system notifications confirming FM/CV status and prior signature; (ii) faculty email correspondence requiring a non-codified "signature revocation" precondition; (iii) institutional replies (e.g., Equal Opportunity Coordinator and Vice-Rector); (iv) peer testimonies and chat exports evidencing both suppression and comparators; (v) policy extracts from SZMSZ_HKR (arts 5, 11, 13, 29, 45); (vi) photographic documentation of examination specimens; and (vii) international notifications and acknowledgments (WFME/FAIMER→MAB; ECFMG; DFHERIS). Where possible, primary text is quoted or referenced verbatim for accuracy.

3. Findings

3.1 Denial of Access Despite Registration/Signature

On February 9, 2025, the department communicated that FM students "may only attend lectures" and would need to re-earn a signature by retaking midterms and meeting attendance thresholds before being allowed to attend practicals. No clause in SZMSZ_HKR requires revocation of a prior signature as a precondition for FM/CV access to practicals when registered. The student remained excluded from dissection labs between February and May 2025, despite having paid enrollment and met exam preparation needs.

© 2025 S.H. Wardhan – QA dossier for accreditation/QA review. Case refs: EBF–AJBH–309–2025; 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2.

3.2 Inconsistent/Selective Enforcement

Peer comparators describe being permitted practical access in other departments (e.g., Biochemistry, Biophysics) under FM/CV status, suggesting the "no lab for FM/CV" rule is not universally applied. Absent a published, Senate-approved variance, differential treatment across departments constitutes arbitrary enforcement contrary to SZMSZ_HKR arts 5, 11, 13, and 45.

3.3 Overcrowding and Resource Adequacy

Official correspondence acknowledges enrollment exceeding room capacity for ICM teaching, indicating structural over-enrolment. ESG 1.6 requires that learning resources and physical capacity be adequate and proportionate to enrollment; overfill combined with FM/CV denial illustrates a resource-constraint rationale that is neither codified nor consistently applied.

3.4 Specimen Quality in Assessment

Photographic evidence documents dehydrated, mutilated, or incompletely preserved specimens used in oral/practical assessments. Missing key structures (e.g., cranial nerves, Circle of Willis components) compromises validity and reliability (ESG 1.3) and contravenes resource adequacy (ESG 1.6). This creates a double impediment: preparation barrier (no lab access) and assessment barrier (substandard materials).

3.5 Suppression of Protected Disclosures in Peer Channels

Deletion of a neutrally worded, legally relevant disclosure (Act XXV/2023) from a primary student communication group prevented the collection of comparators and testimonies, creating a procedural disadvantage in an active Ombudsman and Administrative Court case.

3.6 International Notification and Acknowledgment

After national avenues were exhausted, the case was acknowledged abroad: WFME/FAIMER redirected to MAB (Hungarian accreditation), ECFMG archived the complaint, and DFHERIS acknowledged receipt and initiated internal routing. These establish that the matter has entered international QA visibility and archival channels.

3.7 Age-Preference Language in Admissions

Public admissions rules stating applicants are "preferably under the age of 30" raise concerns of indirect age discrimination under Hungarian and EU law when combined with the observed pattern of exclusion for older FM/CV students. Clarification and amendment are warranted.

© 2025 S.H. Wardhan – QA dossier for accreditation/QA review. Case refs: EBF–AJBH–309–2025; 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2.

3.8 Administrative Replies on Record

The Equal Opportunity Coordinator's reply ("what does this have to do with me?") and a Vice-Rector letter outlining general remedy procedures, without addressing the substance of FM/CV access and specimen quality, appear to confirm awareness without corrective action.

4. Legal and Standards Mapping

- Act CCIV/2011 (National Higher Education) – equal access, resource adequacy, transparent procedures
- Act XXV/2023 (Whistleblower Protection) – protection of public-interest disclosures and anti-retaliation
- Act CL/2016 (Administrative Procedure) – decisions must have a written basis and be communicated with reasons
- EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, arts 14, 21, 47 – education, non-discrimination, effective remedy
- SZMSZ_HKR arts 5, 11, 13, 29, 45 – equal treatment, access to practicals, fair procedures, signature and exam rights
- ESG 1.2/1.3/1.6 – deliverability, valid & reliable assessment, adequate resources
- WFME 3.1/3.4 – transparent governance and equitable access to resources

5. Discussion

The dossier evidence (i) an unpublished, department-specific precondition ("signature revocation") that conflicts with the governing framework; (ii) selective application across departments; (iii) resource adequacy issues; and (iv) assessment validity concerns due to specimen condition. Taken together, these create material risks for ESG/WFME alignment and for international recognition of the programme by ECFMG-linked pathways.

6. Requested QA Actions and Remedies

1) Independent Quality Audit: external review of anatomy teaching resources, specimen standards, and assessment validity.
2) Codified, Published Rules: issue a Senate-approved, public policy on FM/CV rights, practical access, and any conditions; apply uniformly.
3) Retrospective Remedy: an academic remedy for examinations conducted with substandard specimens; offer reassessment under adequate conditions.
4) Assured Access: confirmation that registered FM/CV students retain lawful practical access unless expressly limited by a published rule.
5) Admissions Language Review: remove or justify age-preference text to ensure compliance with Hungarian/EU non-discrimination norms.

© 2025 S.H. Wardhan – QA dossier for accreditation/QA review. Case refs: EBF–AJBH–309–2025; 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2.

7. Limitations, Ethics, and Data Protection

This dossier is an evidence-based QA submission, not a judicial adjudication. Named individuals are referenced only where documentary records exist (emails, notices). Peer communications are anonymized on request. Photographs are included solely for QA/educational purposes; no explicit, published prohibition on such documentation was identified in the reviewed materials. All evidence is held under a secure chain of custody.

8. Distribution and Archiving

Distributed via SSRN/ResearchGate with DOIs for persistence. International notifications acknowledged or routed by WFME/FAIMER→MAB, ECFMG, and DFHERIS. The case is actively filed under Ombudsman EBF–AJBH–309–2025 and Administrative Court 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2.

9. Conclusion

The record supports a finding of inconsistent policy enforcement, non-codified barriers to access, and compromised assessment conditions. These are remediable QA issues. Implementing the requested actions would realign practice with SZMSZ_HKR, ESG/WFME standards, and EU fundamental rights while restoring trust for international students.

© 2025 S.H. Wardhan – QA dossier for accreditation/QA review. Case refs: EBF–AJBH–309–2025; 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2.

References (selected)

• Semmelweis University, SZMSZ_HKR, Part III (English, 2024)

• Act CCIV/2011 (National Higher Education, Hungary)

• Act XXV/2023 (Whistleblower Protection, Hungary)

• Act CL/2016 (General Administrative Procedure, Hungary)

• EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (arts 14, 21, 47)

• ESG (2015): Standards 1.2, 1.3, 1.6

• WFME (2015): Standards 3.1, 3.4

• Wardhan, S.H. (2025). Administrative Obstruction in EU Medical Education: Case Study (SSRN preprint)

© 2025 S.H. Wardhan – QA dossier for accreditation/QA review. Case refs: EBF–AJBH–309–2025; 7.Kpk.750.239/2025/2.